LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 731
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Mental Differences Between Men and Women

Neither of the Sexes Is to an Important Extent Superior to the Other

Leo Markun

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 731
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Mental Differences Between Men and Women

Neither of the Sexes Is to an Important Extent Superior to the Other

Leo Markun

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

	Page
The Riddle: Woman	5
Male and Female	17
Boy and Girl	33
Innate and Acquired Differences	46
The Sexual Impulses in Men and Women	58

THE MENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

THE RIDDLE: WOMAN

Men often talk of the feminine as the mysterious sex. The "Eternal Womanly" is sometimes represented symbolically by the Sphinx, "the strangling one," a she-monster famous in legend. The Sphinx of Thebes is said to have proposed a riddle to all the persons she met, and to have slain them upon their failure to solve it. The riddle was, "What being walks in the morning on four feet, on two at noon, and on three in the evening?" The answer is now well known, "Man, for he creeps upon his hands and knees as a baby, then walks upon his own two feet, and finally, in his old age, uses a staff as a sort of third foot." Oedipus, as the story tells us, was the first to solve the riddle. When he had announced his solution, the Sphinx immediately put herself to death.

The Sphinx of Thebes is portrayed with the head and breasts of a woman, but otherwise representing a lion, except that she is winged. Most of the Egyptian sphinxes are images of a recumbent lion, without wings, and with the bosom and features of a woman. But the heads are in some cases those of rams or hawks. By a sphinx, in common speech, we mean one

whose thoughts, purposes, and character are inscrutable or puzzling.

The Theban story (which is very likely of Egyptian origin) suggests symbolically that the power of womankind arises out of concealment. When the mystery of woman departs, nothing is left. In many respects it has served feminine interests to have an enigmatic quality attributed to the sex. Thus is aroused a masculine curiosity which leads to physical experiences which may be of considerable variety, but which yet cannot do away with the original wonder.

If the mystery of femininity has done much for women, it has also injured them. Our ancestors were wont to attribute to the influence of demons and malevolent spirits almost everything which they failed to understand. Of course they could not interpret that magnetic force which draws together the male and the female. As the point of view became predominatingly masculine, it was the woman's power to attract rather than the ability of the man to attract the woman, which became magical. Besides, the woman's part is largely passive, at least seemingly. We do not ask what is in the iron filings that causes them to approach the magnet, but what is in the magnet that attracts iron.

The mystery of woman is revealed, then, as being chiefly the mystery of the sexual impulses and acts. But though the study of sex has cleared up a great deal that was once obscure, it is still the fashion to represent the feminine with an interrogation point.

No longer, in civilized communities, is the "pull" of the female (which is largely the "push" of the male) represented prosaically and literally as witchcraft. Even in the medieval period, this idea was somewhat obscured. The witches were represented as ugly old women who might, however, take the form of youth and beauty. This was the symbolism of ascetic Christianity. The loveliness of this world, the priests taught, is but a thin layer over decay and corruption. The love which is worth while leads to the embrace with the divinity, which is infinitely more satisfactory than the coupling with any lithesome maiden can possibly be.

Yet the medieval conception that women are the creatures of Satan, sent to draw men away from chastity, went hand in hand with a worship of Mary, the immaculate mother of Jesus, and with a chivalrous respect for the female sex that arose in part out of the Mary worship. This dualism has not altogether disappeared, and Edward Carpenter makes much of it in *Love's Coming of Age*, which was written in the last decade of the nineteenth century. To be sure, the form of the distinction between the bad women and the good has altered a great deal. The vigorous attempts now being made to break down the double standard of sexual morality, coming as they do from two different directions, are tending finally to bring the female antimonies together and perhaps also to break down the idol of the Sphinx. A single standard of morality may mean the restricting of the promiscuity of the male or a loosening of the reins with which the woman pretending to

respectability is held. On the one hand, we may behold the neo-Puritans, to whom fornication and adultery are the deadliest of crimes, in the man and in the woman alike. The Mann Act, directed against the traffic in prostitutes, some of whom were supposed to be sent against their will from one city to another, has actually punished with medieval severity various lovers who were careless of state lines. The influence of the Puritan party is so great that our legislators are afraid to tamper with the "White Slave Law" and similar Draconian enactments. Yet the sexual freedom of women is in some ways growing greater.

The new asceticism, by restricting and attempting to destroy prostitution, has assisted in bringing together "good" and "bad" women. Moreover, the particular forms of Mrs. Grundyism which were sacred to Victoria Regina are gradually disappearing. The "free" woman has kicked off some of her skirts and slashed what remains. She has become a voter in many parts of the world, she has—especially during the great European war—acquitted herself reasonably well in many occupations formerly monopolized by males. We know that a woman need not faint away at every slight shock, especially if she is not cribbed within tight corsets. We know that she can run and swim and punch noses and throw weights. In short, we no longer seriously contend that the female sex is a great deal weaker than the male.

That there are physical differences it would be absurd to deny. There are mental differ-

ences, too, but they are by no means so great as some writers have asserted them to be. As for the "mystery" of the female, I suspect that it is somewhat less than that of the male: that is, the psychology of woman, the explanation of a woman's act, is a little simpler than the corresponding psychology of man. This may be because the range of interests and experiences of women still remain below that of men, as a general thing. Love and marriage mean more to the normal woman than they do to the normal man. Very few women who have failed to attain a successful marriage feel themselves to be happy in life, no matter how well they may have done in other respects. Therefore it is easier to tell why a woman is doing certain sorts of things than it would be in the case of a man. When a woman who has shown a high regard for the conventionalities suddenly begins to flout them, we know almost surely that love enters into the matter. It may in some cases be love for a child, but usually it is love for the companion or one whom she would put in that position. With a man, the reason for such a change may be love, but it may be one of numerous other things.

I have not said that this importance attached to love and marriage by women is a necessary consequence of their physical structure. About the so-called maternal instinct we shall be concerned a little farther on. It certainly is true that ideals of masculinity and feminity have changed a great deal within the last few centuries. To quote Carpenter: "The growing sense of equality in habits and customs—uni-

versity studies, art, music, politics, the bicycle, etc.—all these things have brought about a rapprochement between the sexes. If the modern woman is a little more masculine in some ways than her predecessor, the modern man (it is to be hoped), while by no means effeminate, is a little more sensitive in temperament than the original John Bull. It is beginning to be recognized that the two sexes do not or should not normally form two groups hopelessly isolated in habit and feeling from each other, but that they represent the two poles of *one* group—which is the human race; so that while certainly the extreme specimens at either pole are vastly divergent, there are great numbers in the middle region who (though different corporeally as men and women) are by emotion and temperament very near to each other." This passage is by way of introduction to a discussion of "the intermediate sex." The theory of intermediacy is incomplete, it may be pointed out in passing, because it fails to take account of the active male and the passive female homosexuals.

For our present purpose, though, it is well that we should briefly consider hermaphroditism, or the union of the two sexes in the same individual. This is familiar enough in the plants and in certain sorts of animals. But can a human being be a hermaphrodite, a mixture or combination of man and woman? Modern scientists were for a time disposed to dismiss the idea as an absurd medieval superstition. Yet a few cases have revealed to capable observers the actual existence of mixed

glands or ovotestes. In these persons it is almost impossible to find preponderating male or female elements.

More numerous are those who are male, yet with definite female characteristics, or female, yet to a certain extent male. "There is nothing surprising," says E. Hofmann, "in the fact that a 'hermaphrodite' who is later recognized as a male has all her life pursued female occupations and shown womanly traits, if the individual has always been considered a woman and brought up as such. . . . It is to be noted that sexual feeling and the corresponding actions do not depend entirely upon the presence and full development of the sexual glands concerned, but may exist despite the degeneration or entire defection of these. Children and young animals show this well enough, also eunuchs."

Biologically speaking, the accentuation of the differences between male and female appears to be an advance. Hermaphroditism is characteristic of low organic forms. Sexual selection involves usually the choice by the female of the most masculine individuals, by the male of those which are most feminine. But men still have rudimentary female organs and women similarly show survivals of old hermaphroditism. Thus it is an absolutely scientific fact that there are no pure males, no pure females. This seems to afford a basis for "mental hermaphroditism," for the appearance in men of mental qualities which are supposed to belong to women, in women of

those which are generally considered masculine.

Bloch, who insists that bisexuality and hermaphroditism indicate a low biological level, declares: "Certain phenomena and manifestations of feminism, like the wearing of men's clothing and the smoking of cigars must be interpreted as atavisms to the primitive conditions, which have been retained to this day among the common people. It is sufficient to indicate the man's hat, the short coat, and the high laced boots which a woman of the Tyrol wears and the tobacco smoking by women at the peasants' weddings in middle and lower Germany. Such a false 'emancipation' of women is frequently to be encountered among peasants, vagabonds, and Gypsies."

The appeal to biological development is probably a mistaken one: we cannot say that a certain type of hat or boots or the smoking of cigars is naturally masculine. Nevertheless, it is a serious mistake for women to do that which, by general consent, only a man should do. Men do want to court women who seem like women, not individuals of doubtful sex. Of course the business woman may do well to put on tailored garments of masculine cut and a shirtwaist with a high collar provided that she really wants to discourage flirtations during her working hours. But going too far in this direction—wearing knickers, let us say—may defeat its own purpose by arousing a great deal of attention. Putting on bifurcate garments to make the men look has proved a somewhat unsuccessful venture because it

causes much derision. Perhaps it is merely a matter of habitude, but most men find women more attractive in skirts. At least in some cases, it might be added, the skirts should be fairly long. Long hair is usually more enticing than short, for the same reason that it emphasizes sexual difference.

Physically, the male varies from the female in the greater development of bones and muscles. Women's bones are smaller and weaker. Especially in the pelvic region is the difference striking. In this regard, human beings show a greater sexual variation than do any of the other animals, including the anthropoid apes. The average man is about seven or eight per cent taller than the average woman. He has a relatively shorter torso than she, but his limbs are proportionately longer, The average man is considerably broader of shoulder than the average woman. He weighs about twelve per cent more than she. Bischoff's investigations show that about forty-one percent of a man's weight is muscle and about eighteen per cent fat, while for women the figures are respectively thirty-six and twenty-eight. The breasts and the buttocks are characteristic fatty developments in women. Men have darker and rougher skins than women. The red blood corpuscles are more numerous in the male of our species than in the female. The larynx of women remains small and is capable of higher tones than those a normal man can produce.

Men have (literally speaking, of course) larger heads than women. "The woman's skull,

in many details of its construction," says Iwan Bloch, "remains strikingly like that of the child. This infantile characteristic of the woman's skull does not permit the inference of feminine inferiority, however. Schultze, mentioning these skull differences, reminds us properly of the well-known fact that many men of genius possess infantile qualities."

The skull of the average woman is smaller than that of the average man. The male of European stock, on the average, possesses a brain weighing some ten per cent more than that of the female. There have been some attempts made to found a claim for masculine superiority upon this fact. It is by no means conclusive evidence, however, especially since it goes with a general difference in size and weight between male and female.

No definite relationship between brain weight and intellectual capacity has ever been established. Nor has it been possible to show any certain differences in construction between the brain of a man and that of a woman. It is usually maintained that the range of variability is greater in masculine brains, but even this has been denied by a number of eminent anthropologists.

With regard to the bodily differences in general, we may say that women remain closer to the infantile type. But this alone is insufficient reason for calling the female inferior. Some writers have tried to show that the child type is superior to the adult.

Which is more beautiful, man or woman? Probably because the principal artists have

been men, we are inclined to think of loveliness in terms of the female. "It is only the man whose intellect is clouded by his sexual impulses," says Schopenhauer, "that could give the name of *the fair sex* to that undersized, narrow-shouldered, broad-hipped, and short-legged race; for the whole beauty of the sex is bound up with this impulse. Instead of calling them beautiful, there would be more warrant for describing woman as the unesthetic sex. Neither for music, nor for poetry, nor the fine arts, have they actually any sense or susceptibility; it is a mere mockery if they make a pretense of it in order to assist their attempt to please. Hence, as a result of this, they are unable to take a *purely objective interest* in anything; and the reason for it seems to me the following. A man tries to acquire *direct* mastery over things, either by understanding them or by forcing them to his will. But a woman is always and everywhere reduced to obtaining this mastery *indirectly*, that is, through a man; and whatever direct mastery she may have is confined altogether to him."

Schopenhauer had his own reasons for misogyny. As for beauty, without examining its bases too closely, we may readily see that it depends upon the observer. While men do not make loveliness in women absolutely the same thing as sexual attractiveness, the two are closely related. If women by no means ignore masculine beauty, however, they are aroused by a number of other qualities. Genius in a man draws women far more than genius in a woman draws men. It has been said, not

without justification, that women admire the intellectual qualities in a man because they see in them the means of making money and providing them with luxuries. But this is certainly not the whole story. Else we should not find impoverished sculptors and poets finding refuge with wealthy widows, as they occasionally do. Women often pay homage to the creators of beauty even when there can be no question of their obtaining any tangible advantages in this way. In the making of art, the female sex has played an important part quite aside from the work which women have directly performed. They have served as models and sources of inspiration, and the attempt to please them has certainly aroused many a writer of literature and composer of music.

MALE AND FEMALE

There are women with beards and low voices, there are men who are practically hairless on the face and whose voices are feminine. Psychologically, where the sexual differences are far less clear, the mixture of male and female confronts us on all sides. But let us see what is meant by masculine mind and a feminine mind.

"It appears," says Professor Edward L. Thorndike, "that if the primary sex characters —the instincts directly related to courtship, love. child-bearing, and nursing—are left out of account, the average man differs from the average woman less than many women differ from one another. . . . . Some girls like to fight better than some boys; some men are fonder of babies than some women." He goes on to deal with the traits which are popularly considered to belong to the sexes, "the greater originality, activity, independence, and frankness of the male, and the greater emotionality, interest in personal appearance, and religiousness of the female . . . . Nearly all women are more original than the least original man, and probably over a third of women are more original than the average man. Nearly all men are more religious than the least religious woman, and probably about one third are more religious than the average woman."

Dr. Arnold Lorand asserts, indeed, that "a

woman naturally must think differently from a man, since she differs from him in the skeleton, the muscles, the skin, and even in regard to the details of the brain." Considerations of muscular and skeletal differences are not without importance. Men who are comparatively weak physically tend to make up for their deficiences to a certain extent by cultivating guile and trickery, or even by reaching a full intellectual development which would not be theirs except for the efforts they put forth by way of compensation for their weakness: The woman who cannot climb a tree to reach an attractive apple gets it indirectly, by smiling to a "big strong man." But what do we mean when we say she cannot climb the tree? Is it because her muscles are too weak or because she is wearing skirts? Or even because it is "unladylike" to do such a thing?

The sexual glands are said to exert great influence upon mental activity, and the fact that these differ in men and women may account for some of the variations in thought and action. Lorand speaks of the frequent occurrence of chlorosis and anemia in girls and women, with the resulting effects upon the circulation of the blood and the brain cortex. These particular ailments have been considerably reduced since women have largely given up tight corsets and excessive amounts of clothing and since they have adopted more athletic habits.

Menstruation in women and the periods of unfitness before and after childbirth compel interruptions of their work or at least reduce

their efficiency. "Supposing all the other forces equal," argues Frederic Harrison, "it is just the five per cent of periodical unfitness which makes the whole difference between the working capacity of the sexes." Dr. Leta S. Hollingworth brings forward some evidence to the effect that menstruation does not necessarily lead to any considerable physical and mental deterioration. The control of procreation, which is a reality despite the hostile attitude of church and state, reduces the time which a woman who is married (or who has extramarital sexual intercourse) must devote to her feminine functions. However, unless we are to act in such a way that ours will be the last generation of human beings or we can learn to change many of the effects of bearing children, it is clear that some of our women will find their place in industry limited by the fact of the interruptions due to their sex. Here is Mrs. Mavity's solution, in a *Harper's* article:

> When my second baby came I took no leave of absence. During that winter, the three men who had desks in the same room with me had all been out for several weeks with influenza, and on those occasions I had helped to carry their work. Nevertheless, I had reason to fear that if I took time out the interpretation would be that a married woman should not hold my position. I went regularly to the office until one night (a bit of bravado, this!) I drove my own car to the hospital. I had left two weeks' work prepared in advance. But when the baby was three days old I set up a typewriter on my hospital tray, and was keeping in touch with the office through my husband as daily intermediary.

A report of the Russell Sage Foundation

tells us: "In addition to susceptibility to injuries of the generative organs, working women have been found more liable than men to disease in general." Their diseases last longer, they are less resistant to fatigue, "and their organisms suffer more gravely than men's from the strains and stresses of industrial life."

Harry L. Hollingworth and A. T. Poffenberger, in their book on *Applied Psychology*, deny the validity of these conclusions. They argue that a great many working women must look after homes while they are engaged in industry, whereas men seldom are under such obligations. It cannot be denied that women are capable of holding many positions which are ordinarily given only to men. In war time, there were female iron workers, street car conductors and motormen, farmers, chauffeurs, elevator operators. Some of them did their work very well, but almost all were dismissed upon the return of the soldiers. Of course the greater strength of the male enables him to do many sorts of work which it would be impossible for the ordinary female to accomplish. This difference is largely innate, although training tends to accentuate it. For certain forms of muscular exercise, like swimming, though, women possess definite advantages.

The making of comparisons between boys and girls who play and go to school together or between men and women employed at similar tasks presents a number of difficulties. In the first place, we have only vague criteria.

Although some psychologists have devised tests for various mental qualities which they claim to be reasonably accurate, we are still entitled to take a skeptical attitude. Even for the lower grades of intelligence, the tests are crude. Certainly it is unsafe to assume that any person who has pursued a year of graduate study in psychology can recognize unticketed genius by means of the answers given in a standardized examination.

In a college where young men and women study together, the two groups have been differently selected. The men may go because they cannot otherwise enter professional schools, because gentlemen in their circles are usually college graduates, or because they have not yet made up their minds as to what profession they intend to pursue. They may even attend college to amuse themselves for four years with athletics and a thin layer of culture. As yet, college attendance for girls is by no means considered a prerequisite for admission to the best social circles. Many young women are married by the age of twenty, while the proportion is somewhat smaller in the case of men. Those women who go to colleges are, on the whole, more intellectual and more serious-minded than the men.

In some occupations, men are preferred to women chiefly because marriage will not make them give up their positions. There are various reasons why theater ushers of the male sex are gradually supplanting those of the female, but the fact that they are likely to prove more ambitious is most in their favor. The

lad who is working for a small salary knows that he must attend to his business and prepare himself for a better position. It is very seldom that relationships with the other sex can be lucrative for him. As for the lass—and the girl who is employed in a theater is pretty sure to be reasonably attractive—not merely inclination but also thoughts of profit make her coquettish. The way out of poverty for her is through marriage or some other relationship with an individual or individuals of the opposite sex.

In Dr. Thompson's tests, as reported by E. L. Thorndike, it appeared that men are more ingenious than women, are quicker in carrying out an action, but have weaker memories. Professor Thorndike expresses the opinion that the comparatively unimportant mental differences between the sexes shown in school and college tests are mostly to be explained by differences in training.

Many psychologists and anthropologists insist that the greatest difference between male and female arises out of the greater variability of the male. Hence, it is said, there are more male men of genius and also more male idiots and lunatics than there are women. But this idea has been vigorously contested, notably by Karl Pearson.

The fact that there are more men than women in asylums for the insane does not lead necessarily to the conclusion that there are more men than women who are mentally pathological. Since the female sex is not generally confronted with the same keen com-

petition as the male, the defects and irrationalities peculiar to her are less likely to come before the public notice. In a poor family, when the husband displays symptoms of such a sort that he can no longer engage in his usual occupation, he is almost sure to be sent to an asylum. Usually there is no alternative. But if the wife becomes mildly insane, it is often possible to arrange things so that she can stay at home. Perhaps she dresses herself fantastically, possibly she leaves the floors unswept and the dishes unwashed. Unless she behaves violently, though, the matter is likely to remain private. As for the woman of low mentality who happens to be beautiful, she is more likely to engage the attention of a wealthy man who expects her to look attractive, not to do anything in particular, than she is to be examined by the superintendent of a home for the feeble-minded.

One thing is certain, that far more men than women have distinguished themselves by their genius. Whereas cooking is usually considered a woman's work, the great *chefs de cuisine* are all male. Men are the great housekeepers, the heads of the leading hotels and institutions. Here, of course, there is a question of opportunity. Some of the women who have been entrusted with the management of hotels and restaurants have done well enough.

However, differences in opportunity by no means explain the great distance between the accomplishments of men and those of women. Cattell made a list of one thousand persons whom he chose as the most eminent persons

of the civilized world. Of course such a list varies according to the compiler, but there is no evidence that Cattell weighed it by design in favor of his own sex. Of all the names, only thirty-two are those of women. Belles-lettres and fiction, in which fields women seem to have accomplished more than in any other, give ten names, as compared with seventy-two men.

According to Havelock Ellis, women of intellectual eminence are to men so distinguished numerically in the ratio of one to eighteen. And he, it is quite evident, tries to favor the feminine side. He includes among his great women Hannah More, Mrs. Montague, and Mrs. Somerville. The last-named, he says, he includes among the eminent scientists although she has no claim to be other than a popularizer.

Joan of Arc, although she was somewhat daft, was without question a great leader. Sappho's genius cannot be questioned, even if we must judge it only from the poetic fragments which have come down to us. Mme. Curie's work as a scientist is important. Jane Austen's novels entitle her to a high place in English literature, and numerous other female writers would deserve mention in any complete summary of the great work which women have accomplished.

We are certainly not justified, then, in maintaining that women as such are debarred from genius. But we are confronted with the fact that men have done most of the world's great work. Let us bar military leaders and kings:

the condition remains nevertheless substantially the same. Leta Hollingworth contends that women have been prevented from doing first-rate work by the fact that the gestation and infancy of each child is a matter of six years. She declares that the practice of birth-control will give feminine genius a greater chance to develop.

"If," declares John Stuart Mill, "Men had ever been found in society without women, or women without men, or if there had been a society of men and women in which the women were not under the control of the men, something might have been positively known about the mental and moral differences which may be inherent in the nature of each. What is now called the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing—the result of forced repression in some directions, unnatural stimulation in others. . . . In the case of women, a hot-house and stove cultivation has always been carried on of some of the capabilities of their nature, for the benefit and pleasure of their masters." He goes on to say that the psychologists have learned little about the bases of character, especially with regard to the two sexes. His words are still substantially true, although psychology has developed enormously since he wrote.

"It is but of yesterday," Mill remarks, "that women have either been qualified by literary accomplishments, or permitted by society, to tell anything to the general public. As yet very few of them dare tell anything which men, on whom their literary success depends, are

unwilling to hear." Matters have indeed changed a great deal in the past sixty years, and many women have ventured to speak out freely. The motto on the title-page of Mme. de Stael's *Delphine*, "A man may defy public opinion, a woman must fain submit to it," has now an old-fashioned sound.

The lack of originality in women, in so far as it does not show mental limitations, may rest upon the difficulties which are deliberately put in their way. There are still prejudices against the female physician, lawyer, or banker. and possibly some women who are engaged in professions are held down because of their sex. Women themselves, who, as we might suppose, would prefer to consult professional people of their own sex about various delicate matters, are wont to feel that they can get more expert advice as well as better sympathy from men. How far this feeling is due to sex attraction, how far to a belief that women are mentally inferior, it would be difficult to say.

I was once with two young men, one of whom frightened by a bite he had just received from an unknown dog and wanted some first-aid treatment. The first physician we found at home was a woman. Seeing three young men together, though, she quickly declared that she treated women only, and with these words she closed the door in our faces. I tell this incident because it illustrates one handicap women are under. Whether by nature or as a result of education, they fear men. A male physician

would not refuse to treat a young woman because she brought two girl friends with her.

The more we consider the matter, the more difficult it appears to decide how far the mental differences between the sexes result from special conventions and training, how far from inborn and unalterable conditions. The assertion of Moebius that women are physiologically feeble-minded seems wide of the mark, at least unless it is linked with the statement that practically all men are feeble-minded also. Such an attitude must be considered an extension of the medieval conception of women as either of no importance at all or as the source of all evil, as Weininger, in modern times, has declared her to be.

We must deal here with opinions and guesses more than with scientific facts. Surely, though, Dr. Leta Hollingworth goes too far with this conclusion: "All we can say is that up to the present time experimental psychology has discovered no sex differences in mental traits which would imply a division of labor on psychological grounds." It is true that the problem is not an easy one to study in the laboratory. Nor is it easy to keep apart considerations of mind and of body. We study the human mind through the behavior of the human body.

Women have, indeed, mined coal, handled melting iron, and done the heaviest sorts of agricultural work. There can be little doubt, though, that men are better fitted for such tasks. Frederic Harrison states the conservative case thus: "Either the theory of opening all occupations to women means opening them

to an unsexed minority of women, or it means a diminution and speedy end to the human race, or it means that the severer occupations are to be carried on in a fashion far more desultory and amateurish than has ever yet been known."

Machines have made it possible for girls and women to perform, without fatigue, many tasks which were formerly done laboriously by strong men. The Industrial Revolution, too, is responsible for taking from the housewife many a duty which was formerly hers. The distaff and spindle were succeeded by the spinning-wheel, which vastly reduced the labor of thread-making. This was made obsolete by the spinning jenny, which even in its first crude form enabled a child to do the work of eight or ten spinners. Then Arkwright established the factory system, which, by taking many women from their homes and putting them into factories, did much to set feminism going.

At present, the childless wife whose sole duty is to take care of the housework, especially in a small apartment, and who is supplied with the various electrical devices which have recently been brought out, has much time for herself. The vacuum-cleaner makes quick work of her rugs and upholstered furniture. The machines for washing and ironing clothes enable her to do this work quickly, in case she does not send dirty linen to a public laundry. There are machines for waxing floors, for washing dishes, for preparing breakfast conveniently at the table, and for numerous other purposes. Thus the housewife who believes herself capable of doing work in one of the arts usually

is able to get sufficient time to develop her talent. It is true that many women "take up" cubism or free verse or social work or "New Thought" out of sheer boredom, and in the same spirit with which they go to play bridge or to gossip at a friend's house.

But new leisure has actually helped to develop a great many second and third-rate artists of various sorts among women who had formerly neither the time nor the temerity to engage in such activities. And if first-rate makers of poetry and sculpture do not just now exist among the women, they are certainly very rare among the men of our time. Among our contemporaries, I believe there are only minor poets. The poetry magazines are full of verse, much of it entitled to be called poetry but little of it deserving a second reading. That women are capable of doing such work no longer excites our wonder.

In the seventeenth century, the poems of Ann Bradstreet of Massachusetts won her the name of the "tenth muse." In a prefatory poem, presumably written by a male and signed with the initials C. B., we find the lady complimented thus:

Nature and skill here both in one agree
To frame this Master-piece of Poetry.
False Fame, belye their Sex no more; it can
Surpass or parallel the best of Man.

And N. Ward makes Apollo say, comparing Madam Bradstreet with Du Bartas:

I muse whither at length these Girls will go.
It half revives my chil frost-bitten blood

To see a Woman once do ought that's good:
And, chode by Chaucer's Boots and Homer's Furrs,
Let Men look to't least Women wear the Spurrs.

Mrs. Bradstreet, with the modesty expected of her sex, declares:

Let Greeks be Greeks, and women what they are,
Men have precedency and still excell:
It is but vain unjustly to wage warre;
Men can do best, and women know it well:
Preheminence in all and each is yours;
Yet grant some small acknowledgment of ours,

I wonder if her modesty was entirely sincere. Certainly very few women now feel it necessary to assume such an apologetic attitude. A contemporary of Mrs. Bradstreet, Aphra Behn, was the first Englishwoman to live by her pen. It does not appear that she received any special favor because of her sex, and she was forced to write voluminously to earn a living. Such competition as this tends to destroy the idea of inferiority.

It is easy to see that the women of past centuries tended to acquire those traits which it was expected that they should have. Casanova remarks that women are clearly weaker than men, since both joy and grief kill them more easily. Richardson's lovely and exceedingly virtuous young heroine, Clarissa Harlowe, who has always been in the best of health but who quickly dies of grief after she is raped, would appear a little ludicrous in our time. Goldsmith wrote:

When lovely Woman stoops to folly,
And finds too late that men betray,

What charm can soothe her melancholy,
What art can wash her guilt away?

The only art her guilt to cover,
To hide her shame from every eye,
To give repentance to her lover,
And wring his bosom, is—to die.

T. S. Eliot modernizes the idea:

When lovely woman stoops to folly, and
Paces about the room again, alone,
She smoothes her hair with automatic hand,
And puts a record on the gramaphone.

Though this version has been denounced, it shows pretty well the general change in sentiment.

Bluff Dr. Johnson does not seem to have believed unwaveringly in the inherent chastity of women. He once roared out, "No, no, a lady will take Jonathan Wild as readily as St. Austin, if he has threepence more; and what is worse, her parents will give her to him. Women have a perpetual envy of our vices; they are less vicious than we, not from choice, but because we restrict them; they are the slaves of order and fashion; their virtue is of more consequence than us to our own, so far as concerns this world."

Dr. Johnson represents medieval thinking in a number of ways, and this idea that women are naturally more depraved than men, or at least that their virtue depends upon careful watching, is typical of the older view. Now we are frequently told that women stand for all that is noble. To be sure, we do not fully

accept such a doctrine. But the freeing of women from seraglio walls, girdles of chastity, and the supervision of duennas or eunuchs is already an accomplished fact in the countries of western civilization and is gradually taking place elsewhere.

BOY AND GIRL

"In earliest childhood," says Wilhelm Stern, "the outward conditions of life for boys and girls differ only in insignifcant details—and in spite of this we find the clear indication of male and female idiosyncrasy!" Certainly this fact is important for our inquiry, if we can accept it without question. But we must not ignore the distinction which parents and nurses make from the beginning. The infant is clothed in blue or in pink, according to its sex. I do not mean that the color possesses any sort of mystical influence, but that it indicates the sense of difference, which is very soon reflected in the child's training. The baby boy is told to drink a lot of milk, so that he may grow up into a big man, just like Daddy. As for the baby girl's milk, it will make her a big woman, just like Mother. Certainly the two must develop differently. No system of training yet invented can turn little Johnnie into a being capable of bearing children. But, if it were thought advisable, he could early in life be made familiar with the idea that it will be his duty to take care of the children and to wash the dishes.

In the nature of things, it is well that little girls should be provided with dolls and that their training in motherhood should start in their early youth. But that which is so acquired is certainly not instinctive. (Of instincts

and habits generally I have written in Little Blue Book No. 1230, *Good Habits: How to Form Them*). Without going fully into the question, I may state my conclusion that the human intincts are pretty formless, and that the definite instincts of which some psychologists speak (the instinct of reproduction, of sympathy, of flight, and all the rest) have in them many of the elements of learned habits.

Many writers insist that the fighting instinct is stronger in the male than the female, whereas the parental or nursing instinct is stronger in the female. Thorndike asserts that man is more competitive in intellectual endeavor, in business, and in various other activities because of the fighting instinct. The notion, like many others attached to the conception of instinct, is far-fetched. As a matter of fact, many women "fight" just as hard as men do to establish a business, to provide funds to send a son through college, or to become recognized in their professions. When women are content with routine work at low wages, this is frequently because they consider it only a temporary stop-gap.

Women have occasionally acted as soldiers, and some of them have shown themselves fully as courageous as most men. Greek mythology is full of stories about the Amazons, a race of female warriors. Heredotus says that they fought against the Scythians, who called them "man-slayers." But finally the Scythians married the Amazons. "The women of the Sauromatae have continued from that day to the present to observe their ancient customs, fre-

quently hunting on horseback with their husbands, sometimes even unaccompanied; in war taking the field; and wearing the very same dress as the men. . . . Their marriage-law lays it down that no girl shall wed till she has killed a man in battle." Rawlinson, in a footnote, declares that the Sarmatian women had substantially these habits, from which fact the whole myth probably arose.

It is easy to see why women are not usually taken into the army. Some persons, including the very young and the aged, must be left at home. Many women have babies at the breast. Others are always on the point of giving birth to children. The mingling of the sexes would tend to loosen discipline and to reduce the grim seriousness of the warriors. Among some primitive peoples, cohabitation is forbidden for some time before any fighting or hunting expedition sets out. We no longer think of all the reasons, for it has become a custom not easily violable that only the males should do the fighting. The "fighting instinct" of the male is hardly more than a rationalization, an attempt to explain an old tradition.

If boys fight more than girls, this may be because they are made to think that fighting is a sign of manliness. They are usually taught that they should never seek a quarrel but that they should return blow for blow if attacked. Then they are encouraged to play games in which sharp competition is an essential element and in which quarrels are sure to arise. However, boys are not the only fighters. Little girls pull hair, scratch, even punch and slap,

on occasion. Many a little sister has vigorously pounded her little brother, at the same time crying for aid and exclaiming that only very wicked boys beat girls.

"The desire to throw straight and hard seems to be an instinctively masculine desire," says Dr. Gulick. "It is not because of man's special adaptability that he is able to throw better than a woman. A man's shoulder-joint is not very different from a woman's. In fact, what differences there are in the joint seem to be in favor of the woman. But the man has a better neural coördination, a different instinct feeling about throwing."

Boys play baseball, girls seldom do. This I consider a cause of the "throwing instinct" rather than a result. In countries where the throwing games are unknown or without importance, men simply do not experience the desire to throw straight and hard, unless this is of some practical use—as in hunting with a boomerang. In this country, a boy whose deficiencies of vision keep him from learning to throw accurately when he is a child never acquires any such "instinct."

I do not dispute the fact that boys soon display a tendency to play more wildly than girls and that the belligerent street gangs are very seldom Amazonian. Among young children, there is very little difference in strength between the sexes. But the two are drawn into different ways by teaching rather than by unescapable and inherent action patterns.

It is true that the girl "sees the fire-brigade driving, the soldiers marching, and so on, just

as much as the boy does," as Stern says. But they are made to look at these things in different ways. Even so, a girl of five or six is quite as willing to run to see a fire as a boy of the same age. She is made to understand, though, that she will never herself be a fireman or a soldier. She is a girl, and therefore she will some day take care of a kitchen and of children.

Boys are interested in cooking. They make pies and puddings of sand and mud, they like to play with toy stoves and dishes. When they become somewhat older, they enjoy putting potatoes or sweet potatoes into a smoky fire of their own construction. The finished product, although it is almost always raw on one side and burnt on the other, is pronounced delicious.

Toy irons and wash-boards seldom fall into boys' hands unless they take them away from their sisters. Hence it is not surprising that they are reported to be uninterested in washing and ironing, occupations which little girls enjoy. Surely there is no washing-and-ironing instinct. Or shall we say that it is widespread among those Chinese males who come to America?

It cannot be denied that most young boys are interested in dolls. When they have sisters or other girl companions, they "play house," and of course the males are daddies and the females are mammas. But if a boy were brought up as a girl, he would not "instinctively" choose to play the father. Stern

declares that "a boy whose inner instinct leads him often to play with dolls like a girl has doubtless a certain prospect of showing, as a man, a touch of feminine tenderness." The sentence is vague and evidently does not reflect experimentally derived conclusions.

As a matter of fact, many of the most sentimental and tender of men are also the fondest of fighting. Southey says of Lord Nelson: "A portrait of Lady Hamilton hung in his cabin: and no Catholic ever beheld the picture of his patron saint with devouter reverence. The undisguised and romantic passion with which he regarded it, amounted almost to superstition; and when the portrait was now taken down, in clearing for action, he desired the men who removed it, to 'take care of his guardian angel.' In this manner he frequently spoke of it, as if he believed there were a virtue in the image. He wore a miniature of her, also, next his heart." Before Nelson died, he turned to the captain of his ship saying, "Kiss me, Hardy." Grant's men shared their rations with the hungry Confederates. Many similar instances could be cited.

On the other hand, the maternal instinct, as it is usually described, involves a readiness to fight for the offspring if they are attacked. "The female of the species is more deadly than the male," it has been said. Women often murder the men they hate, and the fact that they frequently employ poison or a revolver of small caliber rather than a sword or a rifle points to no instinctive difference.

Gulick declares that women accept defeat

with worse grace than men do, and attributes this to the fact that they are less accustomed to competitive games. If this is so, as I believe it is, it depends again upon educational discriminations. The idea of revenge is the result of teaching, although it depends in part upon the desire to drive out unpleasant emotion by means of actions which bring about more pleasant feelings. If, as it is often contended, women are more sensitive than men, we can readily understand why they should be more revengeful. Probably sensibility is still artificially cultivated in the female sex, as it certainly was during the eighteenth century.

The greater sentimentality of women arises in part from their inhibition, because of social conventions, from acting in accordance with, or in such a manner as to break up, their emotions. Stern declares that the instinct of creativeness, along with that of strife, is greater in the boy than in the girl. Again the idea of instinct is brought in for the purpose of a glib explanation of facts for which we have not altogether been able to account.

Stern declares that, as early as the second year, boys show a tendency to construct new things and to invent, while girls are content to reproduce and to imitate. Such observations, which cannot be made entirely objective, are no doubt influenced by the fact that women have shown themselves somewhat lacking in invention. Yet the recent records of the Patent Office show that recorded inventions by women show a much greater percentage of increase than do inventions by men. Hence we

are justified in concluding that the inventiveness of women has to some extent been hampered by convention and lack of opportunity. The mere feeling of female inferiority is enough to prevent women from seeking new devices and methods and from attempting to put inventions to a practical and wide use.

Gulick declares that teamwork is more natural to boys than to girls. Whereas boys play in gangs, girls are said to prefer to go about in pairs. This is chiefly, I believe, because of the games which girls are taught to play. Even so, girls are readily formed into troops of scouts and like to establish clubs. Whereas men's clubs are chiefly confined to the wealthier classes, many of the women's clubs are made up of persons in moderate circumstances. Women are certainly not less gregarious than men. Such organizations as the Woman's Christian Temperence Union, although they are largely led by male ministers, do show that women are capable of working together for a common purpose. It may be that women often fight for foolish things, but such a fact would not prove them inferior to men.

So long as love and marriage remain the chief interests of women, we must not be surprised to find in the sex a certain lack of loyalty, a certain feeling that each individual is in competition with all the rest. But the feminist and woman's suffrage movements have shown that such antagonism can be cast aside on occasion. Even in school, girls sometimes display a sense of sexual solidarity. If girls are more apt than boys to tattle, this is be-

cause different virtues are cultivated in them. Girls are taught to sit still, to be ladylike and quiet while an older person is talking. But "boys will be boys," parents agree, and they permit the young male to drag about a certain amount of mud and to do more or less shouting. Boys learn in their team plays that they must defend one another. And since whispering in a classroom is to them not a heinous offense, there is little incitive to the betraying of an offender. Such an act would be interpreted as an attempt to become "teacher's pet" —a dread epithet indeed in boyhood. It is equivalent to "sissy," one who sits very still and listens very hard to the teacher, "just like a girl."

Gulick, as against the writers who glorify the increased separation of the qualities of the two sexes, believes that "during the modern age men are acquiring the virtues which have always been predominantly feminine—chastity, love of children, patience, loyalty to home." And he believes that the masculine quality of group loyalty is developing among women. It is somewhat doubtful, to be sure, if men are really growing more chaste and more devoted to their homes than they have been, and it is not entirely clear that such traits have always belonged to the female.

"It is popularly believed and frequently affirmed by psychologists that girls have a nicer appreciation of colors than boys, the latter being compensated by a better sense of form." However, Robert R. Rusk continues, "any superiority which girls possess is probably to be

attributed rather to a greater interest in colors than to a difference in native ability to perceive and discriminate them." And such interest is of course due to special training. Boys are seldom given fabrics of various shades and vari-colored threads with which to sew upon them.

In the first years, it appears that girls develop more quickly than boys. They usually learn to talk sooner and in other respects advance more rapidly. But this condition lasts for only a short time. During the age of puberty, girls again develop more rapidly than boys. At this time, too, the girls show a greater range of variability than the boys. In all the other periods of life, according to Thorndike, the male sex is more variable than the female.

Rusk says that girls excel in memory between the ages of eleven and fourteen, after which the boys overtake and surpass them. It seems to be shown by tests, too, that boys remember abstractions better, while girls have a bettery memory for the concrete. Practically all psychologists agree that the differences between the sexes shown in the mental examination of school children are comparatively unimportant, except perhaps with regard to variability. Terman assembles a great many test results and concludes that "except for the nonexcess of boys in the highest I. Q. [Intelligence Quotient] ranges, the facts we have presented are in harmony with the hypothesis that exceptionally superior intelligence occurs with greater frequency among boys than among

girls." He finds, too, that the gifted girls tend to diverge from the others "in the direction of masculinity." In a large selection of children of exceptionally good mentality made by a number of teachers, the ratio of boys to girls ranged between 116: 100 and 212: 100. It was found that the gifted boys were appreciably superior to the gifted girls in science and nature study, slightly superior in history and civics, slightly inferior in language, literature, music, and art, and slightly superior in the total score.

The investigations of Patterson and Langlie, on the contrary, indicate that girls get better marks than boys. But they add: "We believe these peculiar sex differences in marks are due to a constant tendency to overrate the achievements of girls. In other words, we believe that objective measurements of achievement would prevent in part such overrating of the girls." Terman inquires if his results, which are very different, are not perhaps due to an overrating of the boys! It is evident that the inquiries are self-contradictory and that little that is definite can be concluded from the tests and questionnaires. However, I believe that girls tend to give better effort to their school work in all grades. Boys are more interested in athletics and other extracurricular activities than girls and more wont to frown upon the individuals who distinguish themselves in scholarship.

Patterson and Langlie asked a number of teachers to report on the personal traits of high school seniors. "Analysis of these rat-

ings," they say, "show that teachers' ratings agree with intelligence tests in showing a difference in 'ability to learn' in favor of the boys; a difference in the same direction, but almost negligible, in 'initiative'; difference in favor of the girls in 'industry' (perseverence and application), 'scholastic zeal' (interest in books, independent study), 'dependability' (observance of rules, punctuality, and faithfulness), and in 'capacity for college work'."

Phyllis Blanchard tells us that boys and girls diverge mentally after the time of puberty, when the metabolic processes become different in the two sexes. A group of biologists assert that women are chiefly anabolic (tending to build up protoplasm) while men tend to be katabolic (breaking down protoplasm).

"The fighting male,' says Miss Blanchard in her work on *The Adolescent Girl*, "is the ultimate expression of the power principle, while woman is the embodiment of that richer emotional life which founded the family and society, and is now called to the still higher mission of guiding a civilization that has been too long in the hands of man, who have cursed it with continual strife in their lust for conquest."

This bit of feminism, a little amusing in the naive assumptions upon which it is based, is at least refreshing as a change from Mrs. Bradstreet's attitude of humility. But the idea that women should rule and that they should try to follow their emotions is somewhat dangerous.

In adolescence, many girls find part of their sexual feeling directed into religious channels. Many of the saints on the calendar of the Roman Catholic Church manifested their holiness when they were adolescent girls. The blending of love and religion tends frequently to show itself in the form of an undue deference to priests and ministers of the masculine sex. Schopenhauer declares that woman "needs a lord and master. If she is young, it will be a lover; if she is old, a priest." As a matter of fact, the priest may exert his influence coincidently with the lover.

Women are under no internal compulsion to uphold the rule of the church, but the stressing of their emotionalism results in a willingness to support the priestly party. We must not assume that woman's suffrage has brought a great increase of prestige or power to the sex. A few women have benefited by receiving lucrative positions, many enjoy the new sense of equality with men which such a privilege affords. But the result of an election will seldom be changed because the women are voting. As a rule, husband and wife vote alike. The ecclesiastical politicians could work upon the husbands through the wives even if the latter did not enjoy the franchise themselves. Besides, religious submissiveness is not altogether a feminine matter. Perhaps the future will witness a great increase in the number of women ministers and a corresponding tendency to draw the sexual impulses of men into a new and increased religiousness.

INNATE AND ACQUIRED DIFFERENCES

Why are maleness and femaleness overestimated? Thorndike replies that "literary presentations of the human nature of men and women have been concerned largely with courtship, love and parenthood. It is just in these affairs of life that the sexes do show the greatest mental differences." He goes on to say that "the male sex is the more variable, so that even though the average man is inferior to the average woman in a given trait, the best man in it may be above the best woman. So in music and literature, although the experience of schools and life shows women in general to be not inferior to men, the greatest achievements have been by men. The greatest scientists, poets, painters, and musicians have been more frequently males for the same reason that idiots are more often males." Sex is a genuine but not a great influence, Thorndike concludes. "The variations within one sex are not very much less than the variations amongst men and women together," he adds.

Even if we could conclude definitely that men are superior, on the average, this would not prove Mr. John Doe superior to Mrs. John Doe or Miss Ruth Doe. But we cannot award a palm of superiority to one sex or the other until we can clearly mark out a line of difference. So far as innate or "natural" mental qualities go, we have seen that this is not easy.

We can discriminate, usually, between the behavior of men and women, because the differences in education are added to those of physique. We differentiate masculine from feminine handwriting, and it is usually possible to tell whether an address upon an envelope has been written by a man or a woman. Of course the tint and the odor of the envelope may afford clews.

In the theater, despite old prohibitions and prejudices which still continue, women have gained a great deal of success. Rachel, Sarah Bernhardt, Duse: where, among the men who have trodden the boards in modern times, shall we find a trio with such an international reputation as these three women have won? Arnold Lorand explains the acting ability of women thus: "Notwithstanding the efforts of a rigid education to deaden the sexual impulse, the voice of love would triumph if the maiden's virtue were not strengthened and supported by the fear of possible consequences. She is actually driven to concealment and disguise of her feelings. This is the reason why the art of disguise is developed in women to its highest degree; and we see, in fact, that women representing it are natural-born actresses, and always attain a much higher accomplishment in dramatic art than men."

Havelock Ellis remarks that women develop finesse and ruses to make up for their lack in strength as compared with men. As it seems to me, though women are in many respects more bound by conventional morality than men are, they feel that all is fair in love and war.

It sometimes happens that a man will calumniate his rival in love, indeed. But there are few women who can keep from damning—either directly or with faint praise—those who appear to have love interests conflicting with their own. Certainly no woman should deliberately betray her weakness to a member of her sex who may some day be battling against her. However the fact may arise, men have more regard for the rules of the game. Probably it is easier for a man to throw off the yoke of love, to cast away his disappointment when he loses. Mantegazza declares that woman is the high priestess of love, while man may remain satisfied with merely "physical emotions." Casanova, the nearest personification of the Don Juan type who has left the story of his life, nevertheless speaks continually of love. It is not made entirely clear, to be sure, just how far *l'amour* differs for him from physical desire. But, if we are to believe him, he was several times tempted to marry women, and he escaped by the merest chance.

In Casanova we have the man who secures the advantages of love largely by means of ruses and clever trickery. Assuming for the moment that the male is the true and only pursuer, the female always the pursued, we can see that in the civilized world the man very seldom secures the woman by using force. Seduction is a hundred times more common than rape, at the very least. Men and women frequently match their wits, each trying to get the most advantageous terms. The woman

who is greatly in love surrenders herself unconditionally, though.

Women are concerned more with facts than with principles, more with that which is near and concrete and personal than with that which is abstract, remote, and impersonal. The opponents of woman's suffrage used to say that the female vote would go to the good-looking candidate rather than to the able one. I do not know that statistics have ever been compiled showing how the women voted when a handsome man ran against an intelligent but homely one. The fact is that women have a great deal of respect for mental capacity, although they sometimes find it in very strange individuals. A great many of the follies which wealthy women commit are due simply to their excess of leisure.

The result of idleness is, in the words of Dr. William S. Sadler, that "some women talk so much and so intensely that they keep themselves on the verge of nervous prostration, independent of the excitement and tension that may pertain to the topic of their gossip." The labor-saving household devices to which reference has already been made tend to afford comparative idleness even to the women of the lower middle classes, unless they have serious interests outside the household.

The woman who seldom ventures beyond her kitchen door tends to become engrossed in trifles: her child's last cold, the calamity that occurred to the mixed pickles, the patterns she has just bought from the *Household Monitor*, appear to her more important than anything

which occurs in the outer world. The old-fashioned German matron, interested in her three K's (which we may translate approximately as kitchen, kirk, and kin), was particularly likely to assume such an attitude. It is a German writer, Loewenfeld, who tells us that the less a woman has to talk about, the more she talks. Some women do not seem to appreciate how boresome their gossip about dresses and the neighbors may become. A great many husbands are driven from home by such an incessant torrent of prattle.

Perhaps the chief fault of their "unfortunate" wives is the fact that they neglect, in spite of all their talk, to flatter their husbands. Both males and females are avid of praise, and many men as well as many women have acted like Mr. Crow in the fable, who dropped his cheese when Mr. Fox praised his voice. In the olden days, when men were supposed to do all the wooing, flattery was considered to be their peculiar weapon. Yet a maiden might exclaim (involuntarily, of course): "My, how brave you are!" In our time, a young lady who is popular with the other sex despite her lack of striking beauty usually is generous, if not in other respects, at least with flattery. The ability to pay compliments gracefully is no doubt the chief ingredient in that vague quality which is known as charm.

Women try hard to dominate the men with whom they have love relationships, but in general I think they prefer to be dominated. Here, as in general where I express my own opinion of male and female qualities, I do not mean to

imply that the condition is necessary because of the way the two sexes are constituted. Possibly it is, but more likely it results from educational differences beginning in childhood. The "henpecked" husband does not entirely satisfy himself, because he knows he has the contempt of his wife as well as of their acquaintances. And though the wife strives hard to maintain the *status quo*, one cannot help suspecting that she would perhaps prefer an overthrowal of her dominion. In Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale*, a knight is made, upon pain of death, to find out what women most desire. His satisfactory answer, somewhat modernized, is:

> "My liege lady, in general," quoth he,
> "Women desire to have the sovereignty
> As well over their husbands as their love,
> To be in mastery over them above."

Such longing must have been greater in a time when the husbands were legally the masters, when the movement to abolish the wife's requirement to obey her husband would have been considered, if not entirely absurd, irreligious. The better such a longing is realized, the weaker it becomes; and a woman who masters her husband is frequently mastered in turn by a lover.

Edward Carpenter, speaking as a friend of the New Woman, declares: "Perhaps (speaking broadly) all the passions and powers, the intellect and affections and emotions and all, are really profounder and vaster in man than in woman—are more varied, root deeper, and

have wider scope; but then the woman has this advantage, that her powers are more co-ordinated, are in harmony with each other, where his are disjointed or in conflict."

Frederic Harrison, in an essay directed against feminism, is really more complimentary to women, asserting that only they can perform "the higher duties of love, beauty, patience, and compassion." He speaks of "the more sympathetic, more alert, more tractable, more imaginative intelligence of women." Maternal love, he declares, "is simply a type of the affection which in all its forms woman is perpetually offering to man and to woman—to the weak, the suffering, the careworn, the vicious, the dull, and the overburdened, as mother as wife, as nurse, as teacher, as servant, as counselor, as purifier, as example—in a word—as woman." The "purifying spiritualizing, humanizing" of society, he goes on to say, is nobler than the products of (masculine) art, philosophy, and genius. Harrison is sure that women are superior in "tact, subtlety of observation, in refinement of mental habit, in rapidity, agility, and sympathetic touch."

Perhaps it might be desirable to cultivate those qualities which he labels feminine among women, those among men which he tells us are masculine. Most of the qualities named, though, fit both sexes equally well. I think Harrison argues almost too eloquently. The feminine superiorities he lists certainly entitle women to an important place outside the home. Iwan Bloch, indeed, when he asserts that women are

clever, tactful, and adroit, draws the conclusion that they would do well in diplomacy.

Bloch tells us, too, that women are quicker of apprehension than men. They read more quickly, for instance. They tend to excel in details and in carrying out routine work. Most writers credit the sex with being better at copying than at doing original work. The female artist, Lorand declares, can observe keenly and reproduce accurately. But "artists like Velasquez, Rembrandt, and Raphael have never been found among women. It is interesting to note that a few women artists like Rosa Bonheur and several great artists whom I know myself manifest manly traits."

No doubt the donning of masculine garments and other similar acts are due largely to an unconscious protest against the inferiority which has usually been attributed to the female. The taking of masculine names (the Bells—that is, Brontës—and the two Georges, Sand and Eliot) is sometimes an attempt to remove the prejudice which men feel against work which they know to have been done by women. Women who write or edit for "he-men," as in the adventure story magazines or certain trade journals, still find it better to use initials rather than the betraying first names.

Lorand declares that a woman pianist who plays well is certain to have masculine hands and to play like a man. But does he mean that excellence (or originality, at any rate) is masculine and that any woman who plays artistically thus displays a manly trait? A woman who drives an automobile skilfully is sometimes

prised with the words, "She drives like a man." In each case, physical as well as mental qualities are concerned.

To Lorand it seems that all the women do well in science have masculine faces and other qualities. But, he adds, many men of genius have something womanly about them. There is a certain bisexuality or hermaphroditism in all persons of extraordinary talent, he maintains. Personally I think this idea is somewhat fanciful, except in so far as rudimentary organs of the opposite sex are found in all human beings. The genius, no matter of which sex, is likely to have sympathy (a "feminine trait") as well as an ability to contend against difficulties (a "masculine trait"). But the assumption that such qualities belong to one sex or the other is highly arbitrary.

It is equally arbitrary, of course, for women to wear skirts and men to wear trousers. Physical reasons can be urged for this; but I do not suppose most of us would be seriously inconvenienced, after the period of habit readjustment, if a new amendment to the Constitution were to compel women to wear trousers and men to wear skirts. Kilts are worn by men whom we certainly cannot accuse of being effeminate. But the tendency for a member of one sex to wear such clothing as is associated with the other is usually considered a sign of homosexuality.

Why do we usually feel, seeing a beautiful woman for the first time, that she is likely to prove stupid? Perhaps because it is unlikely that any one person should have all the good

qualities. But Lorand tells us that the good-looking women are spoiled. They soon learn how unnecessary it is for them to exercise their intellects. He might have added that a great many men object to the combination of beauty and brains. A woman's flattering "You're so clever" is decidedly spoiled if she proves that she is really the clever one. Intellectuality has been traditionally a masculine quality, although the newer writers seem less sure about the matter.

Fickleness has long been attributed to women: "*La donna e mobile.*" And we say that "it is a woman's privilege to change her mind." Of course men change their minds as well, and they are justified in doing so when their reasons are good.

But women don't reason at all, some writers tell us, they simply leap to conclusions. Their intuition is a sort of thinking in which the intermediate processes are more or less subconscious. It is not only women who form opinions on the basis of inadequate information or in accordance with emotions and mental habits. Men, too, rationalize after the fact. To think, to have an opinion, to believe: such ideas as these do not ordinarily depend, either in men or in women, upon any full and exact sort of reasoning. Henshaw Ward has coined the verb "to thob" to express the way in which human beings are wont to generalize. Perhaps the "thobbing" of men is a little more influenced by purely selfish considerations, that of women by a wide variety of feelings, some of them altruistic.

The foolish man is likely to devote his efforts to himself, as best he knows how. Many foolish women devote themselves to others. Thus, there are young women who give all their lives to their mothers or other lazy relatives or to their worthless husbands. The boastful, self-assertive, and egoistic type of woman is not rare, though. She is usually produced or perfected in her selfishness by a doting husband. As a reward for this, he is constantly reproached for his own lack of perfection. Such a beautiful woman should have clothes and jewels and equipages somewhat superior to those of her neighbors. It is altogether the husband's fault if she cannot surpass Mrs. Jones in these respects. But men are by no means devoid of vanity, and often it is by their own desire that their wives are decked out to rival Her Majesty of Sheba.

In America we are somewhat accustomed to think that culture is a feminine matter. Hard-working husbands are willing that their wives should display not only the family diamonds but also the family interest in music, painting, and literature. It is sometimes said that women were the first creators of art, that the fine arts as well as most of the crafts are of feminine origin. It does not take any great muscular strength to write a poem or to paint in oils. On the whole, it seems unnecessary to restrict artistic work to either of the sexes; and the same thing applies, of course, to the appreciation of artistry.

Forel makes the interesting claim that women are superior to men in will power. He declares that whereas men are more impulsive

and more stormy, women tend to remain steadfast in their purposes. Perhaps this is why Lorand says that he would rather incur the hatred of ten men than of one woman. He adds that gratitude in a woman is also long-lasting.

There are fewer women than men in our prisons, but I do not know that this fact can be interpreted to indicate any fundamental and innate mental difference between the sexes. The Italian criminologists of the last generation were generally of the opinion that the prostitute among women corresponds to the criminal among men. In our own time, some very feminine-looking young women have taken up robbery and similar practices.

"One of the commonest charges among women offenders in court is drunkenness," report two Boston physicians, Anderson and Leonard. It is evident, then, that intoxication is not a purely masculine vice. And Doctor Sadler of Chicago is of the opinion that the use of narcotics is increasing among wealthy women. It is not easy to apportion the vices and the virtues between the sexes.

THE SEXUAL IMPULSES IN MEN AND WOMEN

Perhaps it would be safer to deal avowedly with the sexual habits of men and women than to bring in the impulses: the latter term usually carries the implication of innateness. Actually there are very few action patterns of any kind in human beings which we can observe in a form unmodified by training. Havelock Ellis speaks of the "sexual impulse" (in the singular), but the term is made to cover a great variety of actions. Although these possess a certain unity of equivalence, it is hardly accurate to derive them from a single instinct or impulse.

Ellis insists rightly "that the judgments of men concerning women are very rarely matters of cold scientific observation, but are colored both by their own sexual emotions and by their own moral attitude toward the sexual impulse. The ascetic who is unsuccessfully warring with his own carnal impulses may (like the voluptuary) see nothing in women but incarnations of sexual impulse; the ascetic who has subdued his own carnal impulses may see no elements of sex in women at all. . . . Statements about the sexual impulses of women often tell us less about women than about the persons who make them."

The older writers usually say that women are more anxious for cohabitation than men are, but there has been considerable tendency in the

last hundred years to overturn this verdict. It is indeed somewhat difficult to weigh the voluptuousness of men as against that of women, since there are considerable qualitative differences. With regard to the sexual impulses, too, most writers agree that women are more variable than men. Frigidity or anhedonia, most medical authorities say, is much more common among women than among men. But it has been well maintained that few if any women would be frigid if they were enabled to cohabit with men whom they love.

Even from one man to another, there may be considerable difference in sexual desire, pleasure, and ability. A Joseph may flee from a Potiphar's wife not so much because of a desire to commit no evil as from a lack of desire. The moment of impotence is, in some males, an indication of defective attractive power in the females concerned. Some men are drawn to practically all women, others are attracted only by those who possess certain qualities. A Rousseau can be powerless because he is absorbed elsewhere, and a woman may say contemptuously, "Leave women and study mathematics." Casanova tells us repeatedly that ugly women do not interest him. He points out that a beautiful face is the chief attraction in a woman, even when her other beauties are known.

The sexual passivity of women is in part due to their physiological functioning, but it is also stimulated by education. "An insensible woman," says La Bruyère, "is simply one who has not yet seen the man whom she has it in her to

love." But even with regard to a man whom she does love, a woman is likely to force herself to appear passive.

So far as prudery is natural, it is a fear of that which is unknown and unhabitual. Havelock Ellis considers modesty largely the result of an unwillingness to cause disgust in others. Why, then, should women be more modest than men? Some scientists maintain that the modesty of the female (found in many of the animals, not alone in men) serves to excite the male.

Prudishness in human beings usually indicates an undue preoccupation with sexual matters, a tendency to consider them extraordinary. Perhaps, then, the modesty of women is in itself evidence that love and sexuality mean more to them than they do to men. Byron makes Julia write in *Don Juan*:

Man's love is of man's life a thing apart,
'T is woman's whole existence; man may range
The court, camp, church, the vessel, and the mart,
Sword, gown, gain, glory, offer in exchange
Pride, fame, ambition, to fill up his heart,
And few there are whom these can not estrange;
Men have all these resources, we but one,
To love again, and be again undone.

As women are offered more access to gain, glory, fame, and ambition, it seems indeed that they are giving up some of the old false modesty.

The "sublimation" of the sexual impulses seems to be easier for women than for men. They do not appear to have the typical masculine undeniable urging for cohabitation—at least in some cases. Hence it appears that they can

manifest their sexuality more readily in the form of altruistic acts or of artistic work. Such substituted actions cannot, to be sure, altogether take the place of the normal results of love.

The adolescent girl expects something more from love than the adolescent boy does. The Prince Charming of her reveries can never be fully realized. If, however, she can make herself feel that a real man is the object of her dreams, her whole thought is to attach herself firmly to him, to subjugate him with her charms. But this is all so that he may (physically) subjugate her. For he is Prince Charming, and to serve as his footstool may be guerdon enough.

It is true that a man, too, may act foolishly or even insanely because he is in love. If individuality did not matter to a man, the "gold-digger" would have to content herself with very modest ambitions. It is not that the supply of women is very small, but that the demand is particular. Gentlemen do not simply prefer blondes or brunettes. They want certain women, at least for a time. Temporality has no meaning in the height of passion. The man may repent of his vow later, even if he has sworn as sincerely as may be to love one, and to keep on loving her forever. To be sure, an oath impossible of fulfillment is not binding.

No doubt women are more constant in love, despite their general reputation for flightiness. The fact that they bear the children, for whom they are frequently unable to provide them-

selves, contributes to such constancy. Of maternity there can be no doubt, but paternity is frequently difficult to establish. Here is the chief reason for the double standard of morality. The known adultery of the wife tends to upset the whole family relationship. The affection of a father to his children is largely the result of pride in his own achievement, and it is comparatively seldom that a man has parental feelings for step-children. As for the step-mother, she is traditionally cruel, or at least indifferent. There are, indeed, peoples among whom polyandry is a recognized institution, and among whom paternity is usually attributed conventionally to a certain one of the husbands. In doubtful cases, we are wont to compare the appearance of the child and the possible fathers, but we have no definite test. There have been experiments with blood examinations which may prove to have at least eliminative possibilities. It will very likely be possible to show that John Doe, Jr., cannot, because of the nature of his blood, actually be the son of John Doe, Sr. It would take a prophet—and I do not happen to be the seventh son of a seventh son—to foretell accurately the changes in sexual morality which may come about within the next few generations. But it is clear that a reputation for unchastity is now harmful to most women. For a man, on the other hand, it is, in most communities, somewhat shameful to be reputed virginal. Even the Victorian poets (Coventry Patmore, for example) who recommend masculine constancy are a little apologetic in their attitude.

Especially in women, love is likely to bring about an intellectual and emotional fullness which is otherwise unknown. Some women who ordinarily appear colorless and even somewhat stupid blossom out in the presence of their lovers. Cabanis remarks that some girls show remarkable artistic talent in the years immediately following puberty, only to sink into mediocrity later. The dreams of Prince Charming disappear, often enough, and women are forced to live in the world of reality. To a certain extent this concentration of the artistic impulses in adolescence is characteristic of the male sex also. The young man may be concerned for a moment with the rhythm of verse or contour before he becomes absorbed in the poetry of adding machines and cash registers.

The full capacity for love appears to develop somewhat later in women than it does in men. In the adolescent girl, love is usually a vague matter. She feels that it is important, but she does not understand precisely what it is or exactly how to make the most of it. Ovid says that no woman is accomplished in the art of love until she has reached the age of thirty-five: and the women of Italy are certainly more precocious in such matters, on the average, than those of the United States. It may happen, then, that a woman has limited opportunities to practice the art of love after she comes fully to understand it.

With regard to the sexual differences in general, I think they are not so wide or so definite as we are wont to assume. They result largely from diverging systems of training, and

the mental differences arise only in small part from varying physical constitutions. From the evidence now before us, I cannot see how we can escape the conclusion that men have more capacity for genius than women. I am willing to concede, however, that the tendency to equalize opportunities may possibly change matters. For reasons which have been touched upon, the whole problem of the mental differences between men and women has not been fully solved. But, since it seems to be advisable to train men and women somewhat differently, perhaps the innate capabilities of the two sexes will never be fully understood. Clearly neither of the sexes is distinctly and to an important extent superior to the other.